

On the Liaison Between Superconductivity and Phase Separation

S. Haas, E. Dagotto, A. Nazarenko

Department of Physics, National High Magnetic Field Lab, and Supercomputer Computations

Research Institute, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306

J. Riera

Physics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

Models of strongly correlated electrons that tend to phase separate are studied including a long-range $1/r$ repulsive interaction. It is observed that charge-density-wave states become stable as the strength of the $1/r$ term, V_{coul} , is increased. Due to this effect, the domain of stability of the superconducting phases that appear near phase separation at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$ is not enlarged by a $1/r$ interaction as naively expected. Nevertheless, superconductivity exists in a wide region of parameter space, even if phase separation is suppressed. Our results have implications for some theories of the cuprates.

The presence of charge modulations and phase separation in the high-Tc compounds, as well as in other related materials, has recently attracted considerable attention. Experimental evidence has shown that the 38K superconductor $\text{La}_2\text{CuO}_{4+y}$ (LCO) has a regime where phase separation occurs, [1] which is adjacent to a superconducting phase. Hole-rich and hole-poor phases coexist at temperatures below $\sim 230\text{K}$. While a similar macroscopic phase separation does not occur in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ (LSCO), a microscopic segregation of doped holes forming walls of hole-rich material separated by undoped domains has been reported. [2] Phase separation has also been observed in nonmetallic, nonsuperconducting $\text{La}_2\text{NiO}_{4+y}$ (LNO), [3] while electron diffraction techniques applied to $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{NiO}_{4+y}$ have indicated the presence of charge modulations at low temperatures. [4] On the theoretical side, the description of electrons and holes in the high-Tc cuprates is still under much discussion. Among the many proposed theories, scenarios linking phase separation with superconductivity have been discussed. [5–8] In the widely studied two dimensional t-J model phase separation exists at large J/t , and in its vicinity strong superconducting correlations have been detected in the ground state. [5,7] Actually, the presence of superconductivity close to phase separation in electronic models seems a general phenomenon. [8] Fig.1(a,b,c) illustrates these ideas for the particular cases of the one-dimensional (1D) and two-dimensional (2D) t-J model, and also for the 2D t-U-V model i.e. the standard Hubbard model with a nearest-neighbor density-density interaction. There is a growing perception that phase separation and superconductivity are intimately related in electronic models. [6,8]

While a scenario linking phase separation and superconductivity is appealing, the accumulation of charge in the hole-rich phase makes relevant the long-range repulsive Coulomb interaction among the carriers. Certainly such interactions will render the phase separated regimes unstable in Fig.1, while the superconducting phase, being uniform, should not be strongly affected. Thus, a natural interesting possibility arises: can it occur that once phase separation (PS) is suppressed by a long-range force, the parameter regime formerly occupied by PS in Fig.1(a,b,c) is taken over by superconductivity? This effect would notably enhance the region of stability of the superconducting phase. Actually, Kivelson and

Emery predicted that high temperature superconductivity is established once long-range Coulomb interactions eliminate phase separation. [6] However, preliminary studies in the 1D t-J model monitoring the pairing correlation functions showed that superconductivity was not enhanced by the $1/r$ term. [9] It was there conjectured that charge-density-wave (CDW) phases may be responsible for this effect. More recently, a study of a classical spin-one lattice gas model including long-range repulsive interactions among spins observed that the equivalent of ordered charge-modulated states become stable. [10] Similar indications of CDW phases have also been reported in the context of the three band Cu-O chain. [11]

The purpose of the present paper is to discuss a detailed analysis of the competition between superconductivity, CDW and phase separation in electronic models including $1/r$ repulsive forces. We considerably improve upon previous calculations by using realistic models with mobile electrons not only in 1D but also in 2D, and explicitly monitoring the correlation functions corresponding to the three competing phases. More specifically, the t-J model have been studied using exact diagonalization techniques, and the 2D t-U-V model, an effective model for d-wave superconductors, has been also analyzed within a mean-field approximation. We conclude that even in the presence of mobile carriers, CDW phases indeed are stabilized by the $1/r$ term in a large region of parameter space, reducing the potential domain of stability of the superconducting phase. Nevertheless, we have observed that superconductivity is not strongly suppressed either (unless V_{coul} crosses some threshold), and thus the fluctuating phase separation scenario for the cuprates, [6] with some modifications to account for the competition with CDW, remains a viable possibility. The strong competition between superconductivity, CDW, and phase separation in electronic models seems a general phenomenon.

The Hamiltonian for the t – J model with $1/r$ interactions has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{tJ} = & -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) + J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j) \\
& + V_{\text{coul}} \sum_{ij} \frac{n_i n_j}{r_{ij}},
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the c -operators are hole operators acting on non-doubly occupied states, r_{ij} is the shortest distance between sites i and j , and the rest of the notation is standard. To analyze the ground state properties of this Hamiltonian exact diagonalization techniques are used. [12] Charge, spin and pairing correlations are monitored as a function of J/t , V_{coul}/t , and $\langle n \rangle$. In 1D, the conformal field theory parameter k_ρ is also studied. [13]. This parameter is defined as $k_\rho = \pi v_c \langle n \rangle^2 \kappa / 2$, where the charge velocity v_c is obtained from the energy of the lowest spin-singlet state in the subspace with momentum $k = 2\pi/N$ (N is the number of sites), while the compressibility κ at a given number of particles N_e is obtained from the ground state energies with N_e , $N_e + 2$ and $N_e - 2$ electrons, following standard procedures. [13,9] If $k_\rho > 1$ the singlet pairing correlations decay the slowest against distance, and thus are dominant in the ground state. To discuss the results in both the 1D and 2D t - J model, for simplicity we will use the quarter filling density, $\langle n \rangle = 1/2$, where the signals of superconductivity are clear even in 2D small clusters. We have checked that for other densities (where superconductivity exists near phase separation at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$), the results are qualitatively similar as at $\langle n \rangle = 1/2$ (but with CDW states having a different modulation).

To start the analysis, it is helpful to consider the atomic limit $V_{\text{coul}}, J \gg t$, where intuition can be gained about the states that will compete with superconductivity and phase separation. This limit can be studied accurately on large clusters and as anticipated from the spin one model, [10] several CDW phases were observed in the ground state as a function of J/V_{coul} after the $1/r$ interaction makes the phase separated regime unstable. These CDW phases have an increasing number of electrons in each microscopic cluster as J/V_{coul} grows, since J favors the formation of large spin structures to gain antiferromagnetic energy (see Fig.2). Monitoring the density-density correlation functions, we observed that the CDW states are stable even for a finite hopping t , and their rough domain of stability is shown in Fig.2. Phase I is a standard Wigner crystal. Phase II is a Wigner crystal of pairs i.e. a regular distribution of charge $2e$ spin-singlets, similar to those observed in the t - J - V model. [5,7] This state is stable since the pairs take advantage of the short range effective attractive force produced by J . Phase III has clusters with four electrons, and as J increases the size

of these microscopic clusters also increases smoothly producing a cascade of CDW phases. In the limit where J is the only relevant scale, phase separation is recovered. [14]

When the hopping amplitude t is nonzero, intermediate values of J , and a small coupling V_{coul} , a regime of superconductivity exists in the phase diagram as shown in Fig.2. Its boundaries were obtained using exact diagonalization techniques on chains of 12 and 16 sites. [12] This study shows that superconductivity dominates (i.e. $k_\rho > 1$) on a finite region of parameter space, while in the bulk limit phase separation exists only along the $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$ line in Fig.2. In the pure t - J model, the compressibility diverges at the boundary of phase separation, and thus k_ρ on a finite cluster changes sign as shown in Fig.3a. On the other hand, at finite V_{coul} , k_ρ is a smooth function of J/t , it becomes larger than one on a small region, and then it smoothly converges to zero at large J/t . To gain more intuition about the physical behavior of the system, we also studied pairing correlations observing that in the regime where $k_\rho > 1$, these correlations are indeed very strong in the ground state and they continue having a large value, even up to $V_{\text{coul}}/t \sim 0.5$ (with $J/t \sim 3$) i.e. well beyond the apparent stability regime signaled by k_ρ . This curious effect shows that short distance superconducting fluctuations may be relevant in a wide region of parameter space, even if their asymptotic power-law decay is not the dominant one. On Fig.3b, the superconducting (pairing) and CDW (charge) correlations (phase IV of Fig.2) summed over all distances are plotted at a fixed $V_{\text{coul}} = 0.1t$ against the exchange coupling. The competition between the two phases is clear showing explicitly that even when phase separation is made unstable, the region left empty is not necessarily taken over by superconductivity but by a crystal-like charge modulation. Thus, our results confirm the potential importance of charge-density-wave phases in electronic models for the cuprates. [10,9,11]

The analysis of the 2D t - J model is more complicated since there is no analog of k_ρ , and the linear cluster sizes are smaller than in 1D. Nevertheless, 2D is the dimension of interest for the cuprates, and it deserves to be explored. We have carried out an analysis of this case using 4×4 clusters, and monitoring the pairing and charge correlations to set up the phase diagram. In the atomic limit, which can be explored on larger clusters, the set of

stable CDW phases is qualitatively different from the 1D case. As observed before in the context of a classical spin-one system [10] and for the t-J model close to half-filling [15], striped phases (holes ordered in one dimensional chains along the x or y axis) are dominant in most of parameter space. As J increases, the number of contiguous chains of electrons in the striped phases smoothly increases. Away from the atomic limit, a numerical analysis of the pairing correlations similar to that carried out for the pure 2D t-J model (see Ref. [7] for technical details) suggests that superconductivity is robust in a region of parameter space analogous in shape to that observed in 1D. While the actual boundaries between the various phases in Fig.3c should be considered only as qualitative, nevertheless the trends are clear from the numerics, and similar to those in 1D. Thus, our study suggests that although phase separation is destabilized by the $1/r$ correlation, the region left empty is not only replaced by the neighboring superconductivity but also by CDW phases.

To show that this effect goes beyond the t-J model, and it may actually affect all electronic models with coexisting superconductivity and phase separation at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$, here we consider the t-U-V model. Its Hamiltonian is

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \sigma} (c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} + V \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} n_i n_j + V_{\text{coul}} \sum_{ij} \frac{n_i n_j}{r_{ij}}, \quad (2)$$

where the notation is standard (for details see Ref. [8]). The phase diagram at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$ and half-filling was shown in Fig.1c using a mean-field approximation. For simplicity, let us consider $U/t = 0$ which is at the center of the stability region of the d-wave superconducting phase, and an attractive V term which can be effectively produced by spin-polaronic correlations in a more realistic Hamiltonian (results at other values of U/t are qualitatively similar). As was shown before, [8] this model at half-filling has a stable d-wave superconducting phase with order parameter $\Delta_q = \frac{\Delta_0}{2}(\cos q_x - \cos q_y)$, where Δ_0 is obtained through the self-consistent equation $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{k})\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}}{\sqrt{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^2}} = \Delta_{\mathbf{p}}$, with $V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \exp(i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r})[V(\delta_{\mathbf{r},\hat{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{r},-\hat{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{r},\hat{y}} + \delta_{\mathbf{r},-\hat{y}}) + \frac{V_{\text{coul}}}{r}]$. The ground state energy of this condensate is $E_{\text{GS}} = \frac{-\Delta_0^2}{4(V+V_{\text{coul}})} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sqrt{\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{k}}^2} + \frac{E_{\text{PS}}}{2N}$, where E_{PS} is the energy of the

phase separated state (half the lattice empty, the other half doubly occupied). [8] The energies of the CDW and phase separated states can also be written in closed form, but it is impractical to quote them here. We have also introduced a cutoff of four lattice spacings for technical reasons dealing with the $1/r$ interactions. This makes phase separation stable on a finite region for any finite cutoff. A straightforward comparison of the energies of the competing states was enough to establish the mean-field phase diagram shown in Fig.4a. As it happened for the t-J model, in this case also the d-wave phase is eventually suppressed by CDW states. Note that there is a large region of stability for the d-wave phase but this may be a consequence of the approximations made in evaluating the energy of the different phases. However, we do not expect qualitative changes in the phase diagram given improved approximations. Note that the effect of CDW and phase separation is usually neglected in studies of models of d-wave superconductors, which Fig.4b suggests to be a dangerous practice.

In this paper, we have studied the competition between superconductivity, phase separation and charge ordered states in models of correlated electrons both in 1D and 2D. Increasing the strength of the $1/r$ repulsive interaction, we found that superconductivity does not take over the entire region left empty by phase separation, since CDW states become competitive in energy as observed in the spin-one lattice gas model. [10] Nevertheless the superconducting phase survives in the presence of the Coulomb interaction as long as its strength is not too large. In Fig.4b, we summarize our results with a schematic representation of the influence of long-range interactions over an idealized system which at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$ has both superconductivity and phase separation. “g” is the strength of a generic coupling constant which produces an attractive short-range force in the system. It is interesting to attempt to locate some of the known cuprates in different places of this phase diagram (Fig.4b). LCO seems to have a small effective Coulomb interaction or screening length since phase separation exists in this compound, while LSCO may have intermediate values of these parameters that suppress phase separation. LNO (due to its small mobility caused by the large Ni spin) seems located in the CDW region of Fig.4b. Summarizing, in electronic

models where effective short-range attractive forces are operative, superconductivity competes for stability with phase separation if the repulsive $1/r$ interaction is neglected, and with CDW states if $1/r$ interactions are included.

E. D. is supported by the Office of Naval Research under grant ONR N00014-93-0495. J. R. was supported by the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Scientific Computing, by the DOE under contract No. DE-AC05-84OR21400, and under contract No. DE-FG05-87ER40376 with Vanderbilt University.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. D. Jorgensen, et al., Phys. Rev. **B38**, 11337 (1988); D. R. Harshman, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1187 (1989); P. C. Hammel, et al., Phys. Rev. **B 42**, 6781 (1990); Physica **C 185-189**, 1095 (1991); Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 440 (1993).
- [2] J. H. Cho, F. C. Chou, and D. C. Johnston, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 222 (1993); J. H. Cho, F. Borsa, D. C. Johnston, and D. R. Torgeson, Phys. Rev. **B 46**, 3179 (1992).
- [3] D. E. Rice, and D. J. Buttrey, J. Solid State Chem. **105**, 197 (1993); S. Hosoya et al., Physica **C 202**, 188 (1992); J. M. Tranquada, D. J. Buttrey, and D. E. Rice, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 445 (1993).
- [4] C. H. Chen, S-W. Cheong, and A. S. Cooper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2461 (1993); S-W. Cheong, et al., Phys. Rev. **B 49**, 7088 (1994); S. M. Hayden, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1061 (1992).
- [5] V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, and H.-Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 475 (1990); S. A. Kivelson, V. J. Emery, and H.-Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. **B42**, 6523 (1990).
- [6] V. J. Emery and S. A. Kivelson, Physica **C 209**, 597 (1993); S. A. Kivelson and V. J. Emery, preprint 1994.
- [7] E. Dagotto and J. Riera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 682 (1993); Phys. Rev. **B 46**, 12084 (1992).
- [8] E. Dagotto, J. Riera, Y. C. Chen, A. Moreo, A. Nazarenko, F. Alcaraz, and F. Ortolani, Phys. Rev. **B 49**, 3548 (1994).
- [9] M. Troyer et al., Phys. Rev. **B48**, 4002 (1993).
- [10] U. Löw, V. J. Emery, K. Fabricius, and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1918 (1994).
- [11] J. Riera and E. Dagotto, to appear in Phys. Rev. B, August 1994.
- [12] E. Dagotto, Rev. Mod. Physics, July 1994.

- [13] M. Ogata, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2388 (1991).
- [14] Strictly speaking, in 1D there are no ordered states. However, the CDW states have very large correlation lengths and for all practical purposes they behave as having LRO on finite lattices.
- [15] P. Prelovsek and X. Zotos, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 5984 (1993).

Figure Captions

1. Illustration of the presence of phase separation near superconductivity in electronic models *without* $1/r$ interactions: (a) Phase diagram of the 1D t-J model as a function of the electronic density $\langle n \rangle$ and J/t from Ref. [13]. PS denotes “phase separation”, $k_\rho > 1$ ($k_\rho < 1$) implies that singlet superconducting (spin and charge) correlations decay the slowest in the ground state; (b) Schematic phase diagram of the 2D t-J model taken Ref. [8]. The notation is similar to (a) with $x = 1 - \langle n \rangle$, “SC” denoting a mostly d-wave superconducting region, “PM” a paramagnetic region, and “AF” antiferromagnetism; (c) Mean-field phase diagram of the 2D t-U-V model at half-filling (Ref. [8]). SS, DS, CDW, SDW, and PS denote s-wave superconductivity, d-wave superconductivity, charge-density-wave, spin-density-wave, and phase separation, respectively.
2. Phase diagram of the 1D t-J model with long-range $1/r$ interactions (see Eq.(1)) at density $\langle n \rangle = 1/2$ obtained from the analysis of a chain with 16 sites. The region $k_\rho > 1$ is where superconductivity dominates in the ground state. When $k_\rho < 1$ and at small V_{coul} , SDW and CDW competes. At large values of V_{coul} , or to the right of the superconducting region, the ground state is dominated by CDW order (states I, II, III, ... having different charge modulations). The open (full) circles denote holes (electrons). The size of each microscopic cluster in the CDW state increases as J/t increases, and the many CDW phases after IV are not shown. The dashed lines are tentative boundaries separating the different charge orders. Phase separation (PS) is only stable at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0$ in the bulk limit.

3. (a) k_ρ in the 1D t-J model, at density $\langle n \rangle = 1/2$ on a 16 sites chain. The solid line corresponds to $V_{\text{coul}} = 0.00$ and shows the divergence of k_ρ at the point of phase separation. On the other hand at $V_{\text{coul}} = 0.15t$, k_ρ remains finite; (b) Behavior of the pairing and charge susceptibilities (χ_{sup} and χ_{CDW} , respectively) vs J/t at fixed $V_{\text{coul}} = 0.10t$; (c) Phase diagram of the 2D t-J model at density $\langle n \rangle = 1/2$ obtained using a 16 sites square cluster. SC is (d-wave) superconductivity, PM a paramagnetic region, PS phase separation, I is the standard Wigner crystal, II a Wigner crystal of pairs, and III and IV are shown in the figure. Note the strong similarities with Fig.2.
4. (a) Mean-field phase diagram of the 2D t-U-V model including $1/r$ interactions at half-filling. PS denotes phase separation (stable over a finite region since in this calculation since the $1/r$ was truncated at four lattice spacings), d – wave is the superconducting phase, while FL denotes a Fermi-liquid region obtained by turning off the superconducting order parameter in the mean-field calculation. I is a CDW Wigner crystal, II is a one column striped phase (i.e. phase III of Fig.3c), and III is shown; (b) Generic representation of the phase diagram of electronic models with competing short-range attractive and long-range repulsive forces. For details see the text.